



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/432,855	11/02/1999	DESMOND E. WONG	0100.9901360	1672
23418	7590	09/02/2004	EXAMINER	
VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHLZ 222 N. LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60601			MENGISTU, AMARE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2673	(1)	
DATE MAILED: 09/02/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/432,855	WONG, DESMOND E.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Amare Mengistu	2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/10/2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 10-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "***a flat panel display being coupled/decoupled to/from the connector***" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

The specification does not provide support to the following claim limitations as originally filed.

In claim 1, line 1 the recitation of the claim "detecting a monitor";

Line 2, "monitoring a first node of a connector"; "the connector for coupling to a flat panel display"

Lines 4-5, "asserting a first output signal to indicate the first node is a first state; and receiving the first output signal at a flat panel display controller";

In claim 6, the phrase "wherein the step of determining includes. ...When the input is stable for a predetermined amount of time";

In claim 7, "wherein the predetermined amount of time is based upon an internal timer";

In claim 9, "wherein the register value is indicative of a clock count";

In claims 11 and 12, "a flat panel display being coupled/decoupled to/from the connector".

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,4,11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wang** (6,329,983) in view of **Henry et al** (6,559,859).

As to claims 1,4,11-13 **Wang** clearly teaches a method for detecting a monitor the method comprising: monitoring the first node of a connector (col.1, lines 66- col.2, lines 3), the connector for coupling to a flat panel display (col.1, lines 15-24, col.1, lines 55-62,), asserting a first output signal to indicate the first node is in a first state (fig.3 (240,310); first state is indicative of a flat panel display being coupled/decoupled to/from the connector (col.2, lines 33-41).

**Wang** has failed to teach receiving the first output signal at a flat panel display engine. The patent of **Henry et al** clearly states that receiving the first output signal at a flat panel display engine (fig.1 (20); col.2, lines 10-17,31); the first output is stored in a farm buffer (fig.1 (10)) which is equivalent to register; and driving a flat panel from the flat panel engine (col.2, lines 40-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to incorporate the system of video signal to the display engine of **Henry et al** into the device of **Wang**, because this will provide a pixel data sequentially to a display device.

5. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Henry et al as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Verdun et al (6,493,782)

As to claims 2,3,5,10, Wang as modified by Henry discloses a first output signal but has failed to teach the first output signal.

However, **Verdun et al** discloses the first output signal is an interrupt signal (fig.3 (240), 4 (360,370)) and it is for general purpose of a computer (see, abstract); determining if the first input is in a stable state before the step of asserting for a predetermined time (fig.3 (250,260, COL.2, lines 49-54); operating in a normal mode prior to monitoring (fig.3 (210)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to combine the method of outputting an interrupt signal as taught by **Verdun et al** into the device of **Wang** as modified by **Henry et al** since this will allow to determine the status of the device connection without requiring power down cycle of the device.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on 06/10/04 have been fully considered but they are Not persuasive.

The applicant states that fig.2 shows the connector for coupling to a flat panel display and one of ordinary skill in the art would understand a flat panel display being coupled and decoupled to and from a connector without a figure showing such action.

(1) Figure 2 only shows the FDP Connector (112); never show that the connector is coupled to the display. (2) The issue is not whether one skill in the art would understand the connection between the flat panel display and the connector, but question is that the drawing does not show "***the connector for coupling to a flat panel display***" in which Applicant claims his invention.

Applicant states that he couldn't find support for the Examiner's objection to the drawing in the 37 C.F.R. 1.83 (a). The Examiner would like to direct the Applicant to look at 608.02(e) of the MEPE.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amare Mengistu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, T-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



Amare Mengistu  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2673

A.M  
August 31, 2004